

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/778,045	02/07/2001	Takahisa Kurahashi	925-177	6211
23117	7590 01/29/2004		EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			CRANE, SARA W	
1100 N GLEBE ROAD 8TH FLOOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714			2811	
			DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/778,045	KURAHASHI ET AL.
,	Examin r	Art Unit
	Sara W. Crane	2811
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 19 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appear Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment whi al (with appeal fee); or (3) a tim	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
_	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advievent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	statutory period for reply originally set in	the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI		
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) \(\square\) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: as in the final Office action.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	•
10. Other:		Java W Crane Sara W. Crane Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2811

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of reasons of record. In particular, with respect to the 112, first paragraph, rejection, the specification apparently does not disclose anything about a surface being "exposed to surrounding atmosphere." Also,, there is no evidence of record to support Applicant's contention that a surface of a device is necessarily or inherently exposed to surrounding atmosphere. With respect to the 103 rejection, the combination of references is relied upon as explained in the final rejection. The diffusion, or spreading out, of the emission profile is shown in Figure 13 of Krames et al., for example, where the lobes of the profile indicate the spread. Also, the prior art devices are "exposed to surrounding atmosphere" in exactly the same sense as Applicant's devices, i.e., there are figures with no covering layers in the references. As noted in the previous Office action, Vakshoori teaches that a mirror function can be obtained by a single layer (column 3, line 4), so that substitution of a DBR by a single layer would provide a functional device (having the advantages of a single layer).